09:02AM	1					
2	2	UNITED	STATE	S DISTF	RICT COUF	RT
3	3	FOR THE NORT	THERN I	DISTRIC	CT OF CAL	JIFORNIA
2	4	S	SAN JO	SE DIVI	SION	
Į.	5					
6	6	IN RE TELESCOPES ANTITE LITIGATION	RUS'I'	C	CASE NO.	CV-20-03639 EJD
-	7			S	SAN JOSE,	CALIFORNIA
8	8	THIS DOCUMENT RELATES T ALL INDIRECT PURCHASER		NS C	OCTOBER 3	31, 2024
(	9			E	PAGES 1 -	- 27
10	0	TD 7 NO.	ヘカエロル	OF DDO	CEEDINGS	
11	1	BEFORE THE	HONOR	ABLE ED		DAVILA
12	2	A-P-P-E-A-R-A-N-C-E-S	SIAIL	io Dioii	KICI OOD	GE.
13	3		2000110			ADDIN LLD
14	4		BY: A	DAM J.	ZAPALA	
15	5				ROAD, SUI CALIFORNI	
16	6			D		
17	7		BY: C	HRISTO	PHER L. I	FROST Vard, suite 2100
18	8					VARD, SUITE 2100 NIA 90024
19	9		FROST		STAMBAUGI	4
20	0	1	10960	WILSHI	RE BOULEV	VARD, SUITE 2100 NIA 90024
21	1	(APPEARANCES		,		
22	2	(177.1.77.77.40010)	OOMIT		۷/2 5	,
23	3	OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER				GUEZ, CSR, RMR, CRR IBER 8074
24	4				OLLIN INOP	
25	5	PROCEEDINGS RECORDE TRANSCRIPT PRODUCED WITH			CAL STEN	OGRAPHY,

	1	SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA OCTOBER 31, 2024
	2	
	3	PROCEEDINGS
09:19AM	4	(COURT CONVENED AT 9:19 A.M.)
09:19AM	5	THE COURT: THANK YOU. PLEASE BE SEATED. LET'S
09:19AM	6	CALL OUR MORNING MATTER, OUR 9:00 O'CLOCK MATTER. IT'S NOW,
09:19AM	7	THE RECORD SHOULD REFLECT, IT'S 9:20 PACIFIC STANDARD TIME.
09:19AM	8	LET'S CALL 20-3639, HIGHTOWER VERSUS CELESTRON.
09:20AM	9	MAY I HAVE THE APPEARANCE OF THE PARTIES, PLEASE.
09:20AM	10	MR. ZAPALA: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
09:20AM	11	MAY I APPROACH?
09:20AM	12	THE COURT: YES.
09:20AM	13	MR. ZAPALA: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR.
09:20AM	14	ADAM ZAPALA FROM COTCHETT PITRE & MCCARTHY FOR THE
09:20AM	15	INDIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS.
09:20AM	16	THE COURT: THANK YOU. GOOD MORNING.
09:20AM	17	MR. ZAPALA: GOOD MORNING.
09:20AM	18	THE COURT: AND I SEE THE DEFENDANT'S CHAIR EMPTY.
09:20AM	19	IS ANYONE HERE FOR DEFENDANT?
09:20AM	20	MR. FROST: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. GOOD MORNING.
09:20AM	21	THIS IS CHRISTOPHER FROST OF FROST LLP ON BEHALF OF THE
09:20AM	22	DEFENDANTS. MY SINCERE APOLOGIES THAT WE HAVE TO APPEAR BY
09:20AM	23	TELEPHONE TODAY.
09:20AM	24	THE COURT: THANK YOU, MR. FROST. THANK YOU FOR
09:20AM	25	JOINING.

09:20AM	1	I THINK YOUR ASSOCIATE, JOSHUA STAMBAUGH, WAS ASSIGNED TO
09:20AM	2	APPEAR. WE RECEIVED A MESSAGE JUST BEFORE 9:00 O'CLOCK,
09:20AM	3	SOMETHING ABOUT A FLIGHT DELAY, AND THEN IN A SUBSEQUENT
09:20AM	4	REQUEST, THAT IN MR. STAMBAUGH'S OPINION THE MATTER MIGHT BE
09:20AM	5	RESOLVED BY US PASSING THE MATTER AND CALLING IT LAST ON OUR
09:20AM	6	CALENDAR.
09:20AM	7	I REALLY APPRECIATE HIS DESIRE TO HELP ME MANAGE MY
09:20AM	8	CALENDAR, BUT I WOULD PREFER TO CALL THE MATTER NOW IF THAT'S
09:21AM	9	ALL RIGHT WITH YOU, SIR, AND MR. STAMBAUGH?
09:21AM	10	MR. FROST: YES, OF COURSE. WE APPRECIATE YOUR
09:21AM	11	INDULGENCE. MY APOLOGIES AGAIN.
09:21AM	12	THE COURT: WELL, THANK YOU. LET'S GET TO THE
09:21AM	13	BUSINESS AT HAND. THIS IS A MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF
09:21AM	14	SETTLEMENT, AND I DID RECEIVE THE DOCUMENTS REGARDING
09:21AM	15	SETTLEMENT.
09:21AM	16	LET ME, LET ME TURN THEN TO MR. ZAPALA. WHY SHOULD THE
09:21AM	17	COURT GRANT PRELIMINARY APPROVAL HERE?
09:21AM	18	MR. ZAPALA: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
09:21AM	19	ADAM ZAPALA AGAIN FOR THE INDIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS.
09:21AM	20	WE'RE PLEASED TO PRESENT THIS SETTLEMENT. WE THINK IT'S
09:21AM	21	AN EXCELLENT RESULT FOR THE INDIRECT PURCHASER CLASS.
09:21AM	22	THIS SETTLEMENT INCLUDES \$32 MILLION IN REMUNERATION FOR
09:21AM	23	CLASS MEMBERS, WHICH WE BELIEVE IS AN EXCELLENT RECOVERY BOTH
09:21AM	24	IN LIGHT OF THE FACTS AND CIRCUMSTANCES OF THIS CASE BUT ALSO
09:21AM	25	OBVIOUSLY THE EXPERIENCE OF EXPERIENCED CLASS COUNSEL IN

ANTITRUST CASES.

1

2

3

4

09:21AM

09:22AM

09:22AM

09:22AM

09:22AM

09:22AM 6

09:22AM 7

09:22AM 8

09:22AM 9

09:22AM 10

09:22AM 11

09:22AM 12

09:22AM 13

09:22AM 14

09:22AM 15

09:22AM 16

09:22AM 17

09:22AM 18

09:22AM 19

09:23AM 20

09:23AM 21

09:23AM 22

09:23AM 23

09:23AM 24

THE FIRST THING I WILL TALK ABOUT IS SORT OF THE
PROCEDURAL FAIRNESS OF THE SETTLEMENT AND THE FACTORS THAT
COURTS IN THE NINTH CIRCUIT LOOK AT AT PRELIMINARY APPROVAL AND
WHAT IS NOW UNDER RULE 23 A MOTION TO DIRECT NOTICE TO THE
CLASS.

FIRST, THIS WAS NOT A FILE AND SETTLE KIND OF CASE AS IS
OBVIOUS FROM THE MANY ENTRIES IN YOUR DOCKET. THERE'S BEEN
EXTENSIVE LITIGATION IN YOUR CASE, EXTENSIVE DISCOVERY, MOTIONS
PRACTICE, MOTIONS TO COMPEL. AND WHAT THAT MEANS IS THAT THE
PARTIES WERE FULLY INFORMED ABOUT THE STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES
OF THE CASE WHEN THEY NEGOTIATED THE SETTLEMENT. SO THAT'S ONE
ISSUE TO LOOK AT IN TERMS OF PROCEDURAL FAIRNESS, THE AMOUNT OF
LITIGATION THAT OCCURRED. AND OBVIOUSLY, I THINK WE PUT IT IN
OUR PAPERS, BUT THE INDIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS EXPENDED IN
LODESTAR ABOUT \$11 MILLION. SO IN TERMS OF TIME WORKED ON THE
CASE, IT'S BEEN EXTENSIVE. YOUR HONOR HAS RULED ON A NUMBER OF
PLEADING CHALLENGES.

IN ADDITION, THE SETTLEMENT PROCESS WAS OVERSEEN BY A NATIONALLY RENOWNED MEDIATOR, A FORMER MAGISTRATE JUDGE OF THE CENTRAL DISTRICT, JUDGE SEGAL, AND THERE WERE PROTRACTED NEGOTIATIONS.

THIS WAS, AGAIN, NOT A FILE AND SETTLE SORT OF CASE.

THERE WAS AN INITIAL MEDIATION TWO YEARS AGO THAT WAS

UNSUCCESSFUL, ANOTHER MEDIATION OCCURRING A YEAR AFTER THAT

1 09:23AM 2 09:23AM 3 09:23AM 09:23AM 4 09:23AM 09:23AM 6 09:23AM 7 09:23AM 8 09:23AM 9 09:23AM 10 09:23AM 11 09:23AM 12 09:23AM 13 09:23AM 14 09:24AM 15 09:24AM 16 09:24AM 17 09:24AM 18 09:24AM 19 09:24AM 20 09:24AM 21 09:24AM 22 09:24AM 23 09:24AM 24 09:24AM 25

THAT RESULTED IN A MEDIATOR'S PROPOSAL THAT BOTH SIDES

EXPECTED. SO THE ENTIRE MEDIATION PROCESS HAS BEEN OVERSEEN BY

A FORMER FEDERAL JUDGE.

AND THEN IN ADDITION TO THAT, IN TERMS OF THE TERMS OF THE SETTLEMENT, THERE'S NO SIGNS OF COLLUSION, THERE'S NO CLEAR SAILING PROVISIONS OR ANYTHING LIKE THAT. THERE'S NO REVERSION TO THE DEFENDANT. SO A \$32 MILLION DEAL, NONE OF THAT REVERTS TO THE DEFENDANT.

SO IN TERMS OF PROCEDURAL FAIRNESS, WE BELIEVE ALL OF THE SIGNS POINT TOWARDS APPROVAL. THE NEGOTIATIONS WERE ARM'S LENGTH. AGAIN, THERE WERE 3.9 MILLION DOCUMENTS PRODUCED IN THIS CASE, AND MANY OF THOSE HAVE BEEN REVIEWED AT THE TIME OF SETTLEMENT.

IN TERMS OF SUBSTANTIVE FAIRNESS, OF COURSE, AGAIN,

32 MILLION IS REAL MONEY. THIS IS AN INDIRECT PURCHASER CASE.

THEY'RE NOTORIOUSLY DIFFICULT AND COMPLEX AND OFTEN RESULTS IN

ZERO RECOVERY FOR THE CLASS, EITHER BECAUSE OF CLASS

CERTIFICATION DENIAL OR OTHER COMPLEXITIES THAT ARISE IN THE

CONTEXT OF COMPLEX LITIGATION.

IT'S BEEN CASE LAW FOR -- SORT OF BEDROCK CASE LAW IN THE NINTH CIRCUIT THAT SETTLEMENTS ARE FAVORED IN ANTITRUST CLASS ACTIONS, AND THAT'S WHAT THIS IS.

THE VOLUME OF COMMERCE IN THIS CASE HAS BEEN CALCULATED BY
OUR EXPERTS AT A LITTLE OVER 600 MILLION. SO WHAT THAT MEANS
IS DURING THE CLASS PERIOD THERE WERE 600 MILLION IN SALES IN

1 09:24AM 2 09:24AM 3 09:24AM 09:24AM 4 09:24AM 09:24AM 6 09:24AM 7 09:24AM 8 09:25AM 9 09:25AM 10 09:25AM 11 09:25AM 12 09:25AM 13 09:25AM 14 09:25AM 15 09:25AM 16 09:25AM 17 09:25AM 18 09:25AM 19 09:25AM 20 09:25AM 21 09:25AM 22 09:25AM 23 09:25AM 24 09:25AM 25

TELESCOPES IN THE INDIRECT CASES. SO IF YOU LOOK AT THE 32 MILLION, YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT A 5 PERCENT OVERCHARGE, AND THAT COMES OUT TO 32 MILLION, WHICH IS EXACTLY WHAT THE RECOVERY IS.

SO, AGAIN, IN TERMS OF THE AMOUNT OF MONEY GOING TO THE CLASS, WE THINK IT'S MORE THAN FAIR AND ADEQUATE. AND AGAIN, IT'S SUPPORTED BY SOPHISTICATED COUNSEL. THESE ARE THE ONLY KIND OF CASES THAT I DO. I KNOW THAT'S TRUE OF MY COLLEAGUES AS WELL, MS. SRINIVASAN FROM SUSMAN GODFREY AND MS. CHAN FROM LIEFF, CABRASER, HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN.

SO THESE FIRMS AND THE ATTORNEYS WORKING ON THE CASE ARE REALLY EXPERIENCED ANTITRUST COUNSEL, AND, AGAIN, THEIR RECOMMENDATION THAT THE COURT APPROVE IT CARRIES WEIGHT GIVEN THAT KIND OF EXPERIENCE.

IN ADDITION TO SORT OF ALL OF THE SIGNS ABOUT THE FAIRNESS OF THE SETTLEMENT, WE BELIEVE WE HAVE PROMULGATED OR SET FORTH A MULTI LAYERED NOTICE PLAN TO REACH NOTICE TO THE CLASS. THAT INCLUDES INDIVIDUAL NOTICE BOTH BY EMAIL AND U.S. MAIL, ALSO EARNED AND UNEARNED MEDIA AND TARGETED ADVERTISING ON SOCIAL MEDIA TO INFORM THOSE CLASS MEMBERS WHO MAYBE DIDN'T RECEIVE INDIVIDUAL NOTICE ABOUT THEIR RIGHTS.

ALL OF THAT INFORMATION IN TERMS OF THE NOTICE PROGRAM CAN
BE FOUND IN THE DECLARATION OF CARLA PEAK, WHICH WAS SUBMITTED
ALONG WITH THE MATERIALS. AGAIN, WE SUBMIT THAT THAT NOTICE
PLAN IS BOTH CONSISTENT WITH RULE 23 AND DUE PROCESS.

09:26AM	1	AND THEN FINALLY, WE'VE SET FORTH A SORT OF SCHEDULE KEYED
09:26AM	2	OFF OF THE DATE THAT IN THE EVENT THAT THE COURT FINDS THE
09:26AM	3	SETTLEMENT WORTHY OF PRELIMINARY APPROVAL, WE'VE SET FORTH A
09:26AM	4	SCHEDULE FOR SORT OF NOTICE AND OBJECTIONS, EXCLUSIONS, AND
09:26AM	5	THEN ULTIMATELY THE FINAL APPROVAL HEARING.
09:26AM	6	I'M HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS THAT THE COURT MAY HAVE
09:26AM	7	ABOUT THE SETTLEMENT.
09:26AM	8	THE COURT: THANK YOU. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
09:26AM	9	INITIALLY, MR. FROST, ANY COMMENTS THAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO
09:26AM	10	MAKE INITIALLY BEFORE I ASK A FEW QUESTIONS?
09:26AM	11	MR. FROST: NONE, YOUR HONOR. THANK YOU. I THINK
09:26AM	12	MR. ZAPALA DID A FINE JOB OF EXPLAINING THE SORT OF UPS AND
09:26AM	13	DOWNS OF THE SETTLEMENT AND HOW WE GOT THERE.
09:26AM	14	THE COURT: OKAY. THANK YOU.
09:26AM	15	I'M JUST CURIOUS, MY FIRST QUESTION IS JUST ABOUT DO YOU
09:26AM	16	HAVE ANY EXPECTATION OF WHAT EACH CONSUMER MIGHT RECEIVE? AND
09:26AM	17	I KNOW IT'S DEPENDENT ON CLAIM NUMBERS AND THOSE THINGS.
09:26AM	18	MR. ZAPALA: YEAH.
09:26AM	19	THE COURT: I THINK YOUR PAPERS SUGGEST THAT YOU'RE
09:26AM	20	GOING TO BE ABLE TO REACH 80 PERCENT OF PURCHASERS, IS THAT
09:27AM	21	MR. ZAPALA: WITH THE NOTICE PROGRAM, WITH THE
09:27AM	22	NOTICE PROGRAM.
09:27AM	23	THE COURT: RIGHT.
09:27AM	24	MR. ZAPALA: YEAH, THAT'S THE SUGGESTION IN TERMS OF
09:27AM	25	THAT'S WHAT NOTICE PROVIDERS SHOOT FOR IN TERMS OF WHEN

1 09:27AM 2 09:27AM 3 09:27AM 09:27AM 4 09:27AM 09:27AM 09:27AM 7 09:27AM 8 09:27AM 9 09:27AM 10 09:27AM 11 09:27AM 12 09:27AM 13 09:27AM 14 09:27AM 15 09:28AM 16 09:28AM 17 09:28AM 18 09:28AM 19 09:28AM 20 09:28AM 21 09:28AM 22 09:28AM 23 09:28AM 24

09:28AM 25

THEY'RE CRAFTING A NOTICE PROGRAM, THEY SHOOT FOR A REACH OF 80 PERCENT. IT'S CALLED A REACH. IT'S SORT OF A TERM THAT IS USED IN MEDIA AND ADVERTISING. THERE'S A COMPLICATED CALCULATION THAT GOES INTO IT, BUT VERITA, WHICH IS THE NOTICE PROVIDER, DID OPINE THAT THE NOTICE PROGRAM WOULD REACH 80 PERCENT OF THOSE CLASS MEMBERS.

THE COURT: OKAY.

MR. ZAPALA: BOTH THROUGH -- AGAIN, WE DON'T HAVE -- WE HAVE EMAIL AND MAILING ADDRESSES FOR SOME PORTION OF THE CLASS, BUT IT'S NOT THE ENTIRE CLASS. WE ESTIMATE THE CLASS TO BE LARGER THAN THAT. AND THAT'S WHERE THE MEDIA PROGRAM COMES IN TO TRY TO REACH THOSE EXTRA CLASS MEMBERS.

THAT SAID, WE DO HAVE -- AGAIN, WE ESTIMATE THE CLASS TO BE AROUND 4 MILLION. WE HAVE SOMETHING LIKE 2.5 MILLION RECORDS GIVEN A LOT OF THESE PURCHASES OCCUR OVER AMAZON. SO COMPARED TO MANY OF MY CASES, WE ACTUALLY HAVE A LOT OF CONTACT INFORMATION, UNLIKE A LOT OF INDIRECT PURCHASER CASES.

IN TERMS OF YOUR QUESTION ABOUT HOW MUCH EACH CONSUMER
WILL TAKE, AGAIN, IT VERY MUCH DEPENDS ON THE CLAIMS RATE.
WE'RE GOING TO DO EVERYTHING WE CAN TO MAKE SURE THAT CLAIMS
RATE IS AS HIGH AS POSSIBLE. UNFORTUNATELY, INDIRECT PURCHASER
CASES ARE PLAGUED BY LOW CLAIMS RATES, AND ONE OF THE REASONS
IS THAT IT'S THE NATURE OF CLASS ACTIONS. SOME PEOPLE HAVE
LESS IN PURCHASERS, AND, THEREFORE, DON'T TAKE THE TIME TO SEND
IN THE CLAIM FORM. BUT AGAIN, WE'RE TRYING TO MAKE THAT

PROCESS AS EASY AS POSSIBLE.

IT'S DIFFICULT IN INDIRECT PURCHASERS CASES BECAUSE THE DATA THAT YOU GET FROM THE DEFENDANT IS NOT IN PRIVITY WITH YOUR CLIENTS. YOU HAVE TO GET IT FROM THIRD PARTIES, WHICH WE'VE DONE.

ONE OF THE THINGS I'M DOING IN INDIRECT PURCHASER CASES

THAT I THINK IS REAL BENEFIT TO THE CLASS AND TO GET THE CLAIMS

UP IS WE'RE USING THAT INTERMEDIARY DATA THAT WE RECEIVE.

USUALLY IT'S NOT 100 PERCENT BECAUSE, YOU KNOW, WE MAY NOT HAVE

SUBPOENAED FROM ALL OF THE DISTRIBUTORS. THERE MAY BE CERTAIN

TIME PERIODS THAT DISTRIBUTORS DON'T HAVE THAT DATA FOR PART OF

YOUR CLASS PERIOD.

SO IT'S ALWAYS UNDER -- IT DOESN'T COVER THE ENTIRE CLASS,
BUT WHAT WE'VE ENDED UP DOING AND WHAT WE'RE DOING IN THIS CASE
IS WE'RE GOING TO FILL IN THE CLAIM FORMS WITH DATA THAT WE
HAVE. AND CLASS MEMBERS COULD SIGN THAT CLAIM FORM WITHOUT
DOING ALMOST ANYTHING ELSE, YOU KNOW, PROVIDING PURCHASE
RECORDS OR ANYTHING LIKE THAT.

WE THINK THAT'S A REAL BENEFIT. WE'VE NOTICED IN OUR

CASES WHERE WE'VE DONE THAT AND GET MUCH HIGHER CLAIMS RATE,

AND WE REDUCE THE BARRIERS FOR PEOPLE PARTICIPATING IN THE

SETTLEMENT. WE HAVE EVERY INTENTION OF DOING THAT HERE. IT'S

PART OF OUR PLAN.

IN TERMS OF THE DISTRIBUTION PLAN, IT IS PRO RATA. SO A CLASS MEMBER'S SHARE OF THE SETTLEMENT WILL DEPEND ON, A, HOW

1

09:28AM

09:29AM	1
09:29AM	2
09:29AM	3
09:29AM	4
09:30AM	5
09:30AM	6
09:30AM	7
09:30AM	8
09:30AM	9
09:30AM	10
09:30AM	11
09:30AM	12
09:30AM	13
09:30AM	14
09:30AM	15
09:30AM	16
09:30AM	17
09:30AM	18
09:30AM	19
09:30AM	20
09:30AM	21
09:30AM	22
09:30AM	23
09:30AM	24
09:31AM	25

MANY PURCHASES THEY HAD IN TELESCOPES, ONE OR MORE; AND THEN ALSO WHAT PERCENTAGE THOSE PURCHASES MAKE UP OF EVERYONE CLAIMING. SO IT'S KIND OF DEPENDENT ON TWO THINGS: HOW MANY PURCHASES THEY HAD AND THEN HOW MANY PEOPLE END UP CLAIMING. AND THEN THEIR TAKE WOULD BE WHATEVER PERCENTAGE OF THEIR PURCHASES.

THE COURT: SURE. SO DID I READ SOMETHING THAT SAID THAT YOU ANTICIPATE 2 TO 3 PERCENT?

MR. ZAPALA: THAT'S -- I MEAN, THE STUDIES SUGGEST
THAT THAT IS WHAT CLAIMS RATES ARE IN SORT OF SIMILAR CASES, SO
WE SET THAT OUT.

WE HAVE EVERY INTENTION OF BEATING THAT. I THINK WE WILL.

I DO THINK RECENT CLAIMS RATES ARE DOING BETTER. WE HAVE MORE

ELECTRONIC MEANS NOW TO REACH CLASS MEMBERS. YOU KNOW, WE'RE

USING MORE INNOVATIVE TECHNIQUES TO REACH CLASS MEMBERS ASIDE

FROM JUST SNAIL MAIL, WHICH, FRANKLY, NOBODY READS ANYMORE AND

I THINK WAS A LOT OF THE WAYS MAYBE 20 YEARS AGO PEOPLE WERE

TRYING TO REACH CLASS MEMBERS, WHICH IS NOT VERY EFFECTIVE.

SO SOME OF THE STUDIES ARE BASED ON THAT REGIME AND THE REGIME HAS VERY MUCH CHANGED.

IN ADDITION TO THAT, IN TERMS OF DISTRIBUTION, WE DO

INTEND ON DOING ELECTRONIC PAYMENTS WHERE WE CAN, AND, AGAIN,

WE FIND THAT THAT INCREASES THE CLAIMS RATE AS WELL.

SOMETIMES, BELIEVE IT OR NOT, WE SEND OUT CHECKS TO PEOPLE AND

THEY DON'T GET CASHED.

09:31AM	1	THE COURT: I DO BELIEVE IT. PEOPLE RECEIVE
09:31AM	2	SOMETHING, AND THEY DON'T KNOW WHAT A CHECK IS.
09:31AM	3	MR. ZAPALA: RIGHT.
09:31AM	4	THE COURT: SO IS THE CONSUMER TO RECEIVE THEN BASED
09:31AM	5	ON THE NUMBER OF RESPONSES, AND THERE'S A \$32 MILLION, YOU'RE
09:31AM	6	RESERVING AND ASKING THAT THE COURT RESERVE 33 PERCENT FOR
09:31AM	7	ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS?
09:31AM	8	MR. ZAPALA: WE ARE. WE HAVEN'T NOW, THAT'S WHAT
09:31AM	9	WE INTEND ON PUTTING IN THE NOTICE, YOUR HONOR, AND THAT'S JUST
09:31AM	10	A CEILING. IT MAY BE THE CASE THAT WE COME IN AND ASK FOR LESS
09:31AM	11	THAN THAT. IT MAY BE THE CASE THAT WE COME IN AND ASK FOR THAT
09:31AM	12	AND YOU AWARD LESS THAN THAT.
09:31AM	13	BUT WE LIKE TO PUT IN THE HIGH END NUMBER IN THE NOTICE SO
09:31AM	14	THAT NOBODY COULD BE PREJUDICED, RIGHT? YOU CERTAINLY CAN'T
09:31AM	15	PUT IN 25 PERCENT AND THEN COME IN AND ASK FOR 33 PERCENT.
09:31AM	16	THE COURT: SURE.
09:31AM	17	MR. ZAPALA: SO WE PUT IN THE 33 AND A THIRD. WE
09:31AM	18	HAVEN'T LANDED ON THAT YET. IT IS CONSISTENT WITH WHAT OUR
09:31AM	19	LODESTAR IS IN THE CASE IN TERMS OF A LODESTAR CROSS-CHECK, BUT
09:31AM	20	OBVIOUSLY THAT WILL BE A FEE MOTION THAT WE'LL FILE WELL IN
09:31AM	21	ADVANCE OF THE OPT OUT AND OBJECTION DEADLINE, AND THEN THAT'S
09:32AM	22	SUBJECT TO YOUR HONOR'S DISCRETION AND NINTH CIRCUIT CASE LAW
09:32AM	23	AT FINAL APPROVAL.
09:32AM	24	THE COURT: OF COURSE. AND SO TELL ME WHAT THE
09:32AM	25	I'M ASKING YOU TO DO THE MATH IF IT'S A 2 PERCENT OR A

09:32AM	1	3 PERCENT, CAN WE SAY A CONSUMER MIGHT RECEIVE?
09:32AM	2	MR. ZAPALA: OH, IN TERMS OF THE WHEW.
09:32AM	3	THE COURT: YOU NEED TO GET YOUR PHONE OUT.
09:32AM	4	MR. ZAPALA: YEAH, REALLY.
09:32AM	5	WELL, IF WE TOOK THE SO THERE'S 4 MILLION CLASS
09:32AM	6	MEMBERS, JUST APPROXIMATELY. NOW, AGAIN, THAT'S AN ESTIMATE.
09:32AM	7	IT COULD BE WRONG.
09:32AM	8	BUT, YOU KNOW, IF YOU TOOK 32 MILLION DIVIDED BY 4, YOU
09:32AM	9	COULD COME UP WITH A NET OF OR SORT OF A GROSS, THAT WOULD BE
09:32AM	10	THE INDIVIDUAL TAKE.
09:32AM	11	AGAIN, IF WE WENT AND IF WE TOOK FEES OF 10 MILLION, YOU'D
09:32AM	12	BE TALKING ABOUT A \$22 MILLION NET SETTLEMENT FUND, AND I'M NOT
09:32AM	13	SURE WHAT THAT COMES OUT TO.
09:32AM	14	THE COURT: MR. BORDEN IS CALCULATING IT FOR YOU
09:32AM	15	RIGHT NOW.
09:32AM	16	MR. ZAPALA: BUT, AGAIN, I MEAN, ROUGHLY, WE'RE
09:32AM	17	TALKING ABOUT A 5 PERCENT OVERCHARGE ON, YOU KNOW, THESE
09:32AM	18	PURCHASES AND THEN, OF COURSE, YOU'VE GOT FEES AND COSTS.
09:33AM	19	I THINK I PUT MY PHONE AWAY AND TURNED IT OFF.
09:33AM	20	THE COURT: I'M JUST I'M NOT GOING TO HOLD YOU TO
09:33AM	21	THIS FIGURE, BUT I THINK I'M JUST CURIOUS WHAT YOUR INITIAL
09:33AM	22	FIRST PASS THOUGHTS ARE.
09:33AM	23	MR. ZAPALA: YEAH. AND THAT WOULD BE WITH THE
09:33AM	24	ENTIRE CLASS PARTICIPATING, OBVIOUSLY.
09:33AM	25	THE COURT: SURE.

09:33AM	1	MR. ZAPALA: AND THAT'S NOT GOING TO HAPPEN.
09:33AM	2	THE COURT: NO, NO.
09:33AM	3	MR. ZAPALA: SO THE PRO RATA TAKE OBVIOUSLY GOES UP
09:33AM	4	FROM THERE.
09:33AM	5	THE COURT: RIGHT. BUT IF YOU'VE GOT IF YOU HAVE
09:33AM	6	3 PERCENT
09:33AM	7	MR. BORDEN HAS DONE THE MATH, HAVE YOU, MR. BORDEN?
09:33AM	8	MR. BORDEN: I DIDN'T QUITE HEAR ALL OF IT.
09:33AM	9	MR. ZAPALA: I CAN DO IT, YOUR HONOR.
09:33AM	10	THE COURT: SURE. GO AHEAD.
09:33AM	11	(PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS.)
09:33AM	12	THE COURT: YOUR PHONE IS SMOKING THERE, MR. ZAPALA.
09:33AM	13	MR. ZAPALA: I'M PUTTING IT TO THE TEST, YEAH.
09:34AM	14	(PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS.)
09:34AM	15	MR. ZAPALA: I'LL JUST WALK THROUGH THE CALCULATION
09:34AM	16	THAT I DID, AND HOPEFULLY I DID MY MATH RIGHT AND MY HIGH
09:34AM	17	SCHOOL MATH TEACHERS COULD BE PROUD.
09:34AM	18	I TOOK A NET SETTLEMENT AMOUNT OF I WILL CALL IT
09:34AM	19	22 MILLION AND SAY 10 MILLION COME OUT FOR COSTS AND FEES, AND
09:34AM	20	THEN DIVIDED IT BY 120,000, WHICH IS 3 PERCENT OF 4 MILLION, I
09:34AM	21	BELIEVE, AND THAT COMES OUT TO \$183.
09:34AM	22	THE COURT: OKAY.
09:34AM	23	MR. ZAPALA: SO THAT WOULD BE THE PRO RATA TAKE IF
09:34AM	24	THOSE METRICS HOLD UP.
09:34AM	25	THE COURT: SURE. SURE. AND FLUCTUATING FROM THAT

09:34AM	1	IT COULD GO UP, IT COULD GO DOWN.
09:34AM	2	MR. ZAPALA: IF MORE PEOPLE PARTICIPATE, OBVIOUSLY
09:34AM	3	THAT NUMBER WOULD GO DOWN.
09:34AM	4	THE COURT: AND IT'S NOT DEPENDENT ON THE MODEL OF
09:35AM	5	TELESCOPE THAT THEY PURCHASED, IS IT? IF SOMEONE PURCHASED A
09:35AM	6	HIGHER END TELESCOPE
09:35AM	7	MR. ZAPALA: WELL, IT IS IN SO FAR AS THE
09:35AM	8	5 PERCENT THE PERCENTAGE IS APPLIED TO A HIGHER NUMBER, SO
09:35AM	9	THE OVERCHARGE SO, FOR EXAMPLE, YOU KNOW A 5 PERCENT
09:35AM	10	OVERCHARGE ON A \$100 TELESCOPE WOULD BE \$5, AND A 5 PERCENT
09:35AM	11	OVERCHARGE ON A TELESCOPE THAT IS \$1,000 IS MORE THAN THAT.
09:35AM	12	SO IT IS SOMEWHAT DEPENDENT BECAUSE SOMEONE WHO HAD \$1,000
09:35AM	13	PURCHASE HAS A HIGHER PERCENTAGE OF THE PURCHASE TOTAL THAN THE
09:35AM	14	\$100 PERSON IF THAT MAKES SENSE.
09:35AM	15	THE COURT: SO THAT'S ANOTHER METRIC THAT HAS TO BE
09:35AM	16	MET.
09:35AM	17	MR. ZAPALA: BECAUSE IT'S PRO RATA.
09:35AM	18	THE COURT: SO THE \$183 SOUNDS LIKE A GREAT NUMBER,
09:35AM	19	BUT SOMEONE WHO BOUGHT AN ENTRY LEVEL TELESCOPE FOR \$150 IS
09:35AM	20	UNLIKELY TO GET THAT.
09:35AM	21	IS THAT FAIR?
09:35AM	22	MR. ZAPALA: I THINK THAT'S FAIR. AGAIN, I MEAN,
09:35AM	23	THE INDIVIDUAL CLAIMANT WILL TAKE WHATEVER THEIR CORRESPONDING
09:36AM	24	PERCENTAGE IS OF THE DENOMINATOR. SO TO THE EXTENT THAT THEIR
09:36AM	25	PURCHASE MADE UP 1 PERCENT OF THE CLAIMING PURCHASES, THEY

09:36AM	1	WOULD GET 1 PERCENT OF THE NET SETTLEMENT FUND.
09:36AM	2	THE COURT: OKAY.
09:36AM	3	MR. ZAPALA: THAT'S THE NATURE OF A PRO RATA
09:36AM	4	DISTRIBUTION.
09:36AM	5	THE COURT: SURE.
09:36AM	6	MR. ZAPALA: AND I WILL SAY, AND I THINK WE SET
09:36AM	7	FORTH IN OUR PAPERS, BUT THAT'S THE STANDARD DISTRIBUTION
09:36AM	8	SCHEME IN AN ANTITRUST CASE. AND I HAVE DONE LOTS OF THEM IN
09:36AM	9	MY CAREER, AND I CAN'T THINK OF A SINGLE DISTRIBUTION MECHANISM
09:36AM	10	WHERE WE HAVE NOT DONE IT IN THIS MANNER.
09:36AM	11	THE COURT: SURE. AND LET'S TALK ABOUT THE NOTICE
09:36AM	12	THEN.
09:36AM	13	MR. ZAPALA: SURE.
09:36AM	14	THE COURT: IN THE CASES THAT YOU'VE DONE, DO YOU
09:36AM	15	EVER NOTIFY THE CONSUMERS ABOUT WHAT PRO RATA MEANS TO THE
09:36AM	16	DETAIL THAT WE JUST DID?
09:36AM	17	MR. ZAPALA: IT'S SET FORTH IN THE LONG FORM NOTICE,
09:36AM	18	AND I HAVE NEVER IT'S ALWAYS BEEN SET FORTH, FRANKLY, IN THE
09:36AM	19	MANNER THAT WE SET IT FORTH IN THIS NOTICE.
09:36AM	20	THE COURT: RIGHT.
09:36AM	21	MR. ZAPALA: IF YOU WOULD LIKE US TO DESCRIBE IT
09:36AM	22	MORE, WE CAN CERTAINLY DO THAT.
09:36AM	23	THE COURT: THIS IS A WORK IN PROGRESS, "THIS" BEING
09:37AM	24	NOTICE TO THE CLASS. AS YOU SAY, SOCIAL MAILS CHANGE. AND DO
09:37AM	25	PEOPLE READ SNAIL MAIL ANYMORE? I HOPE THEY DO. WE WANT TO

09:37AM	1	KEEP THE POST OFFICE GOING. THAT'S IMPORTANT.
09:37AM	2	BUT PEOPLE SHIFT TO ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS, AND THEN WE
09:37AM	3	HAVE TO SHIFT OUR MESSAGING TO THEM BECAUSE WE KNOW PEOPLE
09:37AM	4	SPEND, WHAT, 1.2 SECONDS ON AN EMAIL LOOKING AT THE HEADER, AND
09:37AM	5	IT'S EASIER TO HIT DELETE THAN IT IS TO OPEN IT AND READ IT, SO
09:37AM	6	WE WANT TO CAPTURE AS MANY
09:37AM	7	MR. ZAPALA: RIGHT. AND THAT'S WHY I REALLY THINK
09:37AM	8	THE MULTI LAYERED APPROACH IS THE BEST WAY TO GO. BECAUSE IF
09:37AM	9	YOU JUST GO SNAIL MAIL, AND YOU'RE GIVING THEM ONE CHANCE, AND
09:37AM	10	IF YOU GO SNAIL MAIL AND MEDIA, YOU'RE INCREASING THE
09:37AM	11	LIKELIHOOD THAT YOU'LL CATCH THEIR ATTENTION.
09:37AM	12	THE COURT: SURE. OKAY. SO LET'S LET ME
09:37AM	13	LET'S SEE. I DID HAVE SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT LET'S GO TO THE
09:37AM	14	CLAIM FORM FIRST.
09:37AM	15	MR. ZAPALA: SURE.
09:37AM	16	THE COURT: THAT'S EXHIBIT E I THINK.
09:37AM	17	MR. ZAPALA: YES.
09:37AM	18	THE COURT: AND ON THE CLAIM FORM, I THINK IT'S
09:38AM	19	PAGE 1 IS WHAT I'M LOOKING AT, ON THE BOTTOM IT SAYS AND
09:38AM	20	THERE'S CLAIM FORM, CLASS MEMBER INFORMATION. THIS IS WHAT THE
09:38AM	21	CONSUMER WOULD FILL OUT
09:38AM	22	MR. ZAPALA: CORRECT.
09:38AM	23	THE COURT: INITIALLY. AND THIS IS GOING TO BE
09:38AM	24	DONE EITHER ON AN EMAIL FORM OR RETURN BY A SNAIL MAIL?
09:38AM	25	MR. ZAPALA: YES, THIS CAN BE DONE SO THIS WILL

09:38AM	1	BE DOWNLOADED FROM THE WEBSITE SO CONSUMERS WILL GET A NOTICE.
09:38AM	2	IF THEY'RE GETTING A MAILED NOTICE, THEY WILL GET THE
09:38AM	3	CLAIM FORM. IF THEY'RE GETTING AN EMAILED NOTICE BECAUSE WE
09:38AM	4	DON'T HAVE A RESIDENTIAL ADDRESS
09:38AM	5	THE COURT: RIGHT.
09:38AM	6	MR. ZAPALA: THEY CAN USE THAT NOTICE TO GO ON
09:38AM	7	THE WEBSITE AND DOWNLOAD THE CLAIM FORM AND DO IT
09:38AM	8	ELECTRONICALLY.
09:38AM	9	THE COURT: OKAY. GREAT.
09:38AM	10	MR. ZAPALA: AND THAT'S AVAILABLE TO ANYONE,
09:38AM	11	INCLUDING PEOPLE WHO ONLY RECEIVE THE NOTICE BY MAIL. ANYONE
09:38AM	12	CAN SUBMIT ELECTRONICALLY OR REQUEST A PAPER COPY.
09:38AM	13	THE COURT: OKAY. SO ON THIS FORM I LOOKED BELOW
09:38AM	14	THE CLASS MEMBER INFORMATION, THIS IS THE INITIAL FORM THAT
09:38AM	15	THEY SAY, YES, I'D LIKE TO BE PART OF THIS CLASS OR THE CLAIM
09:38AM	16	FORM THEY HAVE TO FILL OUT.
09:39AM	17	THE LANGUAGE BELOW IN ITALICS SAYS, "FAILURE TO ADD YOUR
09:39AM	18	UNIQUE CLAIM I.D." AND IF I'M A CONSUMER, I LOOK AT THIS AND I
09:39AM	19	THINK, OH, DEAR, WHERE IS MY UNIQUE CLAIM I.D.?
09:39AM	20	MR. ZAPALA: THAT'S ON THE NOTICE ITSELF.
09:39AM	21	THE COURT: OKAY.
09:39AM	22	MR. ZAPALA: SO WHEN THEY RECEIVE NOTICE OF THE
09:39AM	23	SETTLEMENT, EACH NOTICE WILL HAVE A UNIQUE IDENTIFIER ON IT,
09:39AM	24	AND THEY JUST NEED TO INCLUDE THAT IN THE CLAIM FORM.
09:39AM	25	THE COURT: OKAY.

09:39AM	1	MR. ZAPALA: AND AGAIN, THAT LANGUAGE SOUNDS HARSH
09:39AM	2	IN A WAY, BUT THEY CAN CONTACT THE CLAIMS ADMINISTRATOR TO GET
09:39AM	3	THAT IF THEY LOSE IT. IT'S NOT ALL IS LOST. WE DO EVENTUALLY
09:39AM	4	NEED TO GET IT. AND THE CLAIMS ADMINISTRATOR
09:39AM	5	THE COURT: HERE'S MY SUGGESTION, SHOULD WE
09:39AM	6	"FAILURE TO ADD YOUR UNIQUE CLAIM I.D.," AND THEN IN
09:39AM	7	PARENTHESIS, "FOUND ON YOUR NOTICE," OR SOMETHING LIKE THAT?
09:39AM	8	MR. ZAPALA: SURE.
09:39AM	9	THE COURT: OR "SEE NOTICE," SOMETHING LIKE THAT.
09:39AM	10	AND THEN FLIPPING TO PAGE 2, PAYMENT SELECTION.
09:40AM	11	MR. ZAPALA: YES.
09:40AM	12	THE COURT: AND, YOU KNOW, OF COURSE PARDON ME.
09:40AM	13	AND I LOOK AT THAT AND I THINK DOES THAT MEAN I HAVE TO PAY OR
09:40AM	14	DOES THAT MEAN HOW I'M GOING TO RECEIVE?
09:40AM	15	SO SHOULD WE SAY, "HOW WOULD YOU LIKE TO RECEIVE YOUR
09:40AM	16	PAYMENT," OR SOMETHING LIKE THAT?
09:40AM	17	MR. ZAPALA: ABSOLUTELY.
09:40AM	18	THE COURT: AND THEN THEY UNDERSTAND, I THINK.
09:40AM	19	PARDON ME FOR YOU KNOW, I DON'T MEAN TO SAY I'M DUMBING THIS
09:40AM	20	DOWN, BUT I WANTED TO MAKE IT ACCESSIBLE FOR EVERYBODY.
09:40AM	21	MR. ZAPALA: YOUR HONOR, NOT AT ALL. I THINK THIS
09:40AM	22	IS A VERY USEFUL EXERCISE. CLAIMS ADMINISTRATORS AND CLASS
09:40AM	23	COUNSEL GET INTO THESE RHYTHMS AND CERTAIN WAYS THAT THEY DO
09:40AM	24	THINGS, AND IT'S USEFUL TO HAVE THAT DISRUPTED IN A LOT OF
09:40AM	25	WAYS.

09:40AM	1	THE COURT: I JUST HAD A PASSING QUESTION ABOUT THIS
09:40AM	2	AS WELL. THIS INFORMATION THAT IS OBTAINED HERE, IS THIS
09:40AM	3	CONFIDENTIAL, THE PAYPAL, THE ZELLE, AND THE VENMO, ALL OF
09:41AM	4	THOSE NUMBERS AND ALL OF THAT, IS THAT CONFIDENTIAL TO
09:41AM	5	MR. ZAPALA: WELL, WE HAVE EVERY INTENTION OF
09:41AM	6	KEEPING IT CONFIDENTIAL. WHETHER IT'S CONSIDERED CONFIDENTIAL
09:41AM	7	IN SOME LIKE MACRO SENSE, I DON'T KNOW. IT'S JUST AN ACCOUNT
09:41AM	8	NUMBER.
09:41AM	9	THE COURT: YES.
09:41AM	10	MR. ZAPALA: BUT OUR CLAIMS ADMINISTRATOR HAS
09:41AM	11	EXTENSIVE CONFIDENTIALITY PROTECTIONS AS ANY ENTITY DOES
09:41AM	12	NOWADAYS THAT HAS TO PROTECT DATA.
09:41AM	13	SO THIS ISN'T GOING TO BE SHARED THIS IS NOT SHARED
09:41AM	14	WITH ANYONE OTHER THAN THE CLAIMS ADMINISTRATOR AND THE CLASS
09:41AM	15	MEMBER, UNLESS THE CLASS MEMBER DISCLOSES IT TO SOMEBODY ELSE.
09:41AM	16	THE COURT: SHOULD YOU TELL THEM THAT OR IS THAT
09:41AM	17	NECESSARY?
09:41AM	18	MR. ZAPALA: SURE. WE CAN PUT SOMETHING IN THERE
09:41AM	19	THAT SAYS, YOU KNOW, THE CLAIMS ADMINISTRATOR WILL KEEP THIS
09:41AM	20	INFORMATION CONFIDENTIAL.
09:41AM	21	THE COURT: SOMETHING LIKE THAT. OF COURSE THAT
09:41AM	22	CREATES I'LL SEE IN ABOUT ANOTHER YEAR AND A HALF SOME
09:41AM	23	BREACH OF LAWSUITS FROM THE CLAIMS ADMINISTRATOR, RIGHT?
09:41AM	24	MR. ZAPALA: WHICH JUST HAPPENED, BELIEVE IT OR NOT.
09:41AM	25	WE HAD A DATA BREACH. NOT OUR CLAIMS ADMINISTRATOR,

09:41AM	1	THANKFULLY, BUT A CLAIMS ADMINISTRATOR HAS HAD A DATA BREACH.
09:42AM	2	THE COURT: RIGHT. OKAY. THAT WAS A QUESTION THAT
09:42AM	3	I HAVE.
09:42AM	4	MR. ZAPALA: SURE. I'VE NOTED IT, AND WE'LL MAKE
09:42AM	5	THAT CHANGE, YOUR HONOR.
09:42AM	6	THE COURT: LET'S SEE. THE OTHER QUESTION I HAD, DO
09:42AM	7	WE NEED TO DO ANY LANGUAGE ISSUES IN ANY OF THESE FORMS OR
09:42AM	8	NOTICES?
09:42AM	9	MR. ZAPALA: THE NOTICES ARE PROVIDED WE DON'T
09:42AM	10	SEND THEM OUT IN THE FIRST LANGUAGE, BUT THEY ARE AVAILABLE ON
09:42AM	11	THE WEBSITE IN DIFFERENT LANGUAGES. AND WE INTEND TO DO THAT
09:42AM	12	IN SPANISH AND I THINK JUST SPANISH.
09:42AM	13	THE COURT: OKAY. LET'S SEE. THE EMAIL NOTICE IS
09:42AM	14	IN EXHIBIT B, I BELIEVE, IT'S 391-2B.
09:42AM	15	MR. ZAPALA: I THINK EXHIBIT B AT LEAST I THINK IS
09:42AM	16	THE POSTCARD NOTICE, BUT THEY'RE FUNCTIONALLY VERY SIMILAR.
09:42AM	17	THE COURT: YES, THEY ARE THE SAME, RIGHT.
09:42AM	18	MR. ZAPALA: AND EXHIBIT A IS THE EMAIL NOTICE.
09:42AM	19	THE COURT: GOT IT. YES. THANK YOU.
09:42AM	20	I'M LOOKING AT EXHIBIT A, THE EMAIL NOTICE, AND THERE'S A
09:43AM	21	LOT OF LANGUAGE THERE.
09:43AM	22	MR. ZAPALA: UH-HUH.
09:43AM	23	THE COURT: HOW DO WE KEEP SOMEONE'S ATTENTION?
09:43AM	24	MR. ZAPALA: NUMBER ONE, I WILL SAY THAT VERITA HAS
09:43AM	25	OPINED IN THEIR DECLARATION THAT THIS DOES COMPLY WITH THE

PLAIN LANGUAGE REQUIREMENT.

THE COURT: YES.

MR. ZAPALA: IT'S A BALANCING ACT, RIGHT?

ON THE ONE HAND RULE 23 REQUIRES THAT YOU DISCLOSE CERTAIN INFORMATION TO CLASS MEMBERS, ON THE OTHER YOU WANT TO KEEP IT SIMPLE AND READABLE. THIS IS THE BEST BALANCE THAT WE HAVE COME UP WITH IN TERMS OF INFORMING THE CLASS MEMBERS OF THE INFORMATION THAT THEY NEED TO KNOW ABOUT THE SETTLEMENT, AND THAT'S REQUIRED BY RULE 23, FRANKLY.

IT'S ALWAYS A BALANCE, AND WE'RE HAPPY TO TAKE

SUGGESTIONS. BUT I THINK I WILL SAY IN TERMS OF MY EXPERIENCE,

THIS IS VERY SIMILAR IN NATURE TO THE SHORT FORM NOTICES THAT

ARE OFTEN APPROVED BY DISTRICT COURTS.

THE COURT: AND I GUESS WHAT REALLY POPULATES THIS NOTICE IS THE PARTIES, DOESN'T IT?

MR. ZAPALA: EXACTLY, YEAH. I SUSPECT THAT CLASS

MEMBERS WILL GLOSS OVER THAT INFORMATION TO SOME DEGREE, RIGHT?

I DON'T KNOW THAT THEY'LL READ SYNTA CANADA INTERNATIONALLY

SUPER CLOSELY, BUT I THINK THEY'LL GET A SENSE OF WHO THE

PARTIES ARE.

ONE OF THE THINGS THAT ALSO TAKES UP A LOT OF SPACE IS THE LISTING OF THE INDIRECT PURCHASER STATES, WHICH IS IMPORTANT OBVIOUSLY FOR CLASS MEMBERS TO KNOW BECAUSE IF THEY KNOW, FOR EXAMPLE, WELL, GEE, I ACTUALLY BOUGHT MY TELESCOPE IN TEXAS, RIGHT, I SOMEHOW GOT THIS NOTICE. THAT'S IMPORTANT FOR THEM TO

09:44AM 25

09:44AM	1	KNOW BECAUSE THEY WOULD KNOW ACTUALLY, A, THEY'RE NOT PART OF
09:44AM	2	THE CLASS ACTUALLY, BUT, B, THEY WOULDN'T BE ENTITLED TO
09:44AM	3	PARTICIPATE IN THE SETTLEMENT.
09:44AM	4	SO AGAIN, IT KIND OF MAKES IT LONGER, BUT IT'S NECESSARY
09:44AM	5	INFORMATION FOR CLASS MEMBERS.
09:44AM	6	THE COURT: MAY I SUGGEST UNDER THE "WHO IS
09:44AM	7	INCLUDED," AND THEN THAT FIRST SENTENCE, MAYBE COULD WE BOLD
09:44AM	8	THAT?
09:44AM	9	MR. ZAPALA: YES. SURE.
09:44AM	10	THE COURT: "RECORDS COLLECTED DURING THE LITIGATION
09:44AM	11	INDICATE THAT YOU MIGHT BE COVERED BY THE SETTLEMENT."
09:44AM	12	MR. ZAPALA: UH-HUH. BOLD THAT LANGUAGE?
09:45AM	13	THE COURT: YES, I THINK SO. THAT WOULD CAPTURE
09:45AM	14	SOMEONE'S ATTENTION, I THINK.
09:45AM	15	AND THESE NOTICES ARE TRYING TO PARDON ME, THAT'S THE
09:45AM	16	HOOK TO GET SOMEBODY TO COMPLETE THE APPLICATION.
09:45AM	17	WHAT DOES THE SETTLEMENT PROVIDE? IF AGREED TO, CREATE
09:45AM	18	32 MILLION SETTLEMENT FUND TO PROVIDE CASH PAYMENTS TO CLASS
09:45AM	19	MEMBERS WHO SUBMIT A VALID CLAIM FORM.
09:45AM	20	MAYBE CAN WE PUT YOU TELL ME, TOO "YOU HAVE BEEN
09:45AM	21	IDENTIFIED AS A POTENTIAL," IN BOLD OR SOMETHING?
09:45AM	22	MR. ZAPALA: IN THE FIRST PARAGRAPH?
09:45AM	23	THE COURT: WELL, SHOULD WE PUT THAT IN, "WHAT DOES
09:45AM	24	THE SETTLEMENT PROVIDE?" CATEGORY ALSO.
09:45AM	25	MR. ZAPALA: YOU WANT TO PUT THAT UNDER "WHO IS

09:45AM	1	INCLUDED?"
09:45AM	2	THE COURT: "WHAT THE SETTLEMENT PROVIDES."
09:46AM	3	MR. ZAPALA: GOT IT.
09:46AM	4	THE COURT: MY SENSE IS THAT IF YOU ATTACH THE
09:46AM	5	POSSIBILITY THAT THEY ARE A PLAINTIFF, A VALID CLAIMANT NEXT TO
09:46AM	6	THE \$32 MILLION, THAT PROBABLY GETS SOME ATTENTION.
09:46AM	7	MR. ZAPALA: GOT IT. WE'LL MAKE THAT CHANGE,
09:46AM	8	YOUR HONOR. THANK YOU.
09:46AM	9	THE COURT: JUST OWING TO HUMAN NATURE.
09:46AM	10	MR. ZAPALA: YEAH.
09:46AM	11	THE COURT: THOSE WERE REALLY THE ONLY SUGGESTIONS
09:46AM	12	THAT I HAD.
09:46AM	13	THE OPT-OUT TIME PERIOD AND THE TIME TO OBJECT.
09:46AM	14	MR. ZAPALA: YES, THAT'S SET FORTH IN OUR MOTION ON
09:46AM	15	PAGE 24 WHICH WOULD BE CUED OFF OF 104 DAYS. I KNOW IT SOUNDS
09:46AM	16	LIKE A STRANGE NUMBER, BUT 104 DAYS FROM THE PRELIMINARY
09:46AM	17	APPROVAL ORDER, WHICH IS REALLY ROUGHLY TWO MONTHS FROM WHEN
09:46AM	18	THIS GOES OUT. WE WANT TO HAVE ENOUGH TIME THAT NOTICE GOES
09:46AM	19	OUT. YOU KNOW, YOU'LL WANT AN OBJECTION EXCLUSION DEADLINE TO
09:47AM	20	WHEN NOTICE WENT OUT BECAUSE IT DOESN'T GIVE PEOPLE ENOUGH TIME
09:47AM	21	TO CONSIDER WHEN THEIR OPTIONS ARE. SO NOTICE GOES OUT AND
09:47AM	22	THERE'S A TWO-MONTH PERIOD, A LITTLE OVER A TWO-MONTH PERIOD
09:47AM	23	FOR PEOPLE TO CONSIDER THE SETTLEMENT, CONSIDER WHETHER THEY
09:47AM	24	WANT TO REMAIN PART OF THE SETTLEMENT, AND CONSIDER WHETHER
09:47AM	25	THEY WANT TO OBJECT OR OPT OUT.

09:47AM	1	OBVIOUSLY IN THE INTERIM, THE MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES
09:47AM	2	WILL BE FILED BEFORE THAT SO THEY CAN SEE THAT AS WELL AND
09:47AM	3	DETERMINE WHETHER THEY WANT TO OBJECT TO THAT.
09:47AM	4	THE COURT: OKAY.
09:47AM	5	MR. ZAPALA: CONSISTENT WITH THE PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE
09:47AM	6	ON CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENTS IN THE NORTHERN DISTRICT.
09:47AM	7	THE COURT: GREAT. WELL, THOSE WERE THE ONLY
09:47AM	8	QUESTIONS THAT I HAD.
09:47AM	9	MR. FROST, ANYTHING YOU WOULD LIKE TO ADD, SIR?
09:47AM	10	MR. FROST: NO, YOUR HONOR, NOTHING FROM DEFENDANTS.
09:47AM	11	THE COURT: OKAY. THANK YOU. ANYTHING FURTHER,
09:47AM	12	MR. ZAPALA?
09:47AM	13	MR. ZAPALA: NO, YOUR HONOR. I'M HAPPY TO ANSWER
09:47AM	14	ANY QUESTIONS, BUT, AGAIN, I'M VERY PLEASED THAT WE CAN BRING
09:47AM	15	THIS LITIGATION TO A CLOSE AND TRY TO GET MONEY TO THE CLASS
09:47AM	16	MEMBERS.
09:47AM	17	THE COURT: GREAT. OKAY. WELL, THANK YOU. THANKS
09:48AM	18	FOR WALKING ME THROUGH THIS AND ANSWERING MY QUESTIONS.
09:48AM	19	I DO FIND THAT RULE 23 FACTORS HAVE BEEN MET HERE FOR
09:48AM	20	PRELIMINARY APPROVAL. THIS DOES APPEAR TO BE AN APPROPRIATE
09:48AM	21	SETTLEMENT. IT'S AN ARM'S LENGTH NEGOTIATION. AS COUNSEL
09:48AM	22	SAID, THERE WERE SUBSTANTIAL MOTION PRACTICE, DISCOVERY
09:48AM	23	PRACTICE IN FRONT OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE, AND THE SETTLEMENT
09:48AM	24	DID ARISE FROM CONSIDERABLE TIME SPENT WITH A MAGISTRATE JUDGE.
09:48AM	25	SO I WILL GRANT PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF THE SETTLEMENT.

09:48AM	1	WHAT DATE SHOULD WE SET THEN FOR FINAL?
09:48AM	2	MR. ZAPALA: IF I MAY SUGGEST, YOUR HONOR, BECAUSE
09:48AM	3	THE DATES ARE KEYED OFF OF YOUR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL ORDER, WE
09:48AM	4	COULD SUBMIT A NEW PROPOSED ORDER THAT FIXES THOSE DATES
09:48AM	5	THE COURT: SURE.
09:48AM	6	MR. ZAPALA: ASSUMING THAT THE PRELIMINARY
09:48AM	7	APPROVAL ORDER IS ENTERED SORT OF THE SAME DAY, OR WHATEVER.
09:48AM	8	SO WE CAN DO THAT THROUGH YOUR WORK PORTAL, IF THAT'S EASIER
09:49AM	9	FOR YOU?
09:49AM	10	THE COURT: THAT'S FINE. IF YOU WANT TO SUBMIT
09:49AM	11	SOMETHING OR PREPARE A FORM AND SUBMIT IT, AND THEN WE'LL SIGN
09:49AM	12	IT, AND THEN THE DATES WILL BE FLOWING APPROPRIATELY.
09:49AM	13	MR. ZAPALA: WE'LL DO THAT. THANK YOU.
09:49AM	14	AND I THINK WE INCLUDED A PROPOSED ORDER, AND WHAT I'LL DO
09:49AM	15	IS TAKE THAT PROPOSED ORDER AND PUT THE FIXED DATES ON THERE
09:49AM	16	BASED ON TODAY'S DATE.
09:49AM	17	THE COURT: AND WE'LL CALENDAR IT ON A DATE THAT IS
09:49AM	18	APPROPRIATE FOR OUR CALENDARS AS WELL THAT IS AS CLOSE AS
09:49AM	19	POSSIBLE TO THE TARGET DATE.
09:49AM	20	MR. ZAPALA: RIGHT. I THINK WE HAD SET FORTH, AND
09:49AM	21	I'M NOT SURE WHAT THAT WOULD BE, BUT 154 DAYS FROM TODAY WOULD
09:49AM	22	BE THE FINAL APPROVAL HEARING.
09:49AM	23	SO I'M NOT SURE WHAT THAT IS, AND I DON'T KNOW IF THAT'S
09:49AM	24	CONVENIENT FOR THE COURT, BUT WE'LL PUT THAT IN THE PROPOSED
09:49AM	25	ORDER.

09:49AM	1	THE COURT: THAT'S GREAT.
09:49AM	2	MR. ZAPALA, I JUST WANT TO THANK YOU AND YOUR TEAM, AND,
09:49AM	3	MR. FROST, YOU AND YOUR TEAM FOR REACHING THIS SETTLEMENT.
09:49AM	4	JUST, MR. ZAPALA, IF YOU COULD OFFER YOUR ASSISTANCE IN
09:49AM	5	SETTLING ANY OTHER TELESCOPE CASES, WE WOULD BE GRATEFUL.
09:49AM	6	MR. ZAPALA: YOUR HONOR, I WOULD BE MORE THAN HAPPY
09:49AM	7	TO DO THAT ONCE WE REACH FINAL APPROVAL, I CAN TURN MYSELF INTO
09:50AM	8	A MEDIATOR AND DO WHATEVER YOU NEED. I'D BE HAPPY TO WORK FOR
09:50AM	9	FREE ON THAT.
09:50AM	10	THE COURT: I DON'T KNOW. IN THE UNIVERSE OF
09:50AM	11	TELESCOPE CASES AND LITIGATION THERE MIGHT BE SOME OTHER STRAY
09:50AM	12	COMMENT FLOATING OUT THERE THAT COULD BENEFIT FROM SOME
09:50AM	13	SUBSTANTIAL GRAVITY.
09:50AM	14	MR. ZAPALA: I'M READY AND WILLING AND READY TO ROLL
09:50AM	15	UP MY SLEEVES, YOUR HONOR.
09:50AM	16	THE COURT: GREAT. THANK YOU. SEE YOU SOON. THANK
09:50AM	17	YOU.
09:50AM	18	(COURT CONCLUDED AT 9:50 A.M.)
	19	
	20	
	21	
	22	
	23	
	24	
	25	

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
I, THE UNDERSIGNED OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER OF THE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA, 280 SOUTH FIRST STREET, SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA, DO
HEREBY CERTIFY:
THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT, CERTIFICATE INCLUSIVE, IS
A CORRECT TRANSCRIPT FROM THE RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS IN THE
ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER.
Arene Rodriguez
Chara was
IRENE RODRIGUEZ, CSR, RMR, CRR CERTIFICATE NUMBER 8074
DATED: NOVEMBER 1, 2024